

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated June 6, 2003, the Examiner objected to the specification and rejected claims 21-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Heimsoth et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,764,915).

By this amendment, Applicants have amended the specification to include the missing U.S. Patent Application Serial Numbers. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Further, Applicants have amended claim 21 to correct a minor typographical error associated with the phrase "deferring reconstruction of the object until requested to perform reconstruction by," which was inadvertently presented twice in the claim.

The Examiner asserts that Heimsoth et al. teaches all of the recitations of claims 21-42. Based on the following remarks, Applicants traverse the Examiner's position and request that the rejection of claims 21-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Heimsoth et al. teaches an object-oriented protocol interface that establishes communication paths between endpoints in a network. According to Heimsoth et al., the interface uses the same set of protocol class objects to develop several protocol layers. The Examiner asserts that the rebuilding process performed by the server taught by Heimsoth et al. in column 29, lines 41-46 and column 31, lines 5-18 teaches deferring reconstruction of an object until requested by a program, as recited in claim 21. Applicants respectfully disagree.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

The client-server communication process disclosed by Heimsoth et al. allows an AccessOP object to be sent to a server using RPC mechanisms. The server rebuilds the object using specific code (e.g., TNetworkOperation) and calls a specific method, which results in the creation of protocol layer objects (See Heimsoth et al., col. 29, lines 41-49). Further, Heimsoth et al. discloses a communication process that allows a server to rebuild an object sent to the server by a client using an RPC mechanism. Accordingly, Heimsoth et al. merely discloses communication processes that use conventional RPC mechanisms that include object rebuilding functions. Heimsoth et al. does not teach or suggest deferring the reconstruction of an object received in the form of a stream from an RPC mechanism, as recited in claim 21. In fact, the reference teaches a communication process consistent with conventional systems that automatically rebuild or reconstruct received objects. This process is distinguishable from the recitations of claim 21, which defers the reconstruction of an object until requested to do so by a program.

Because Heimsoth et al. does not teach or suggest the recitations of claim 21, Applicants request that the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claim 22 depends on claim 21. As explained, claim 21 is distinguishable from Heimsoth et al. Accordingly, claim 22 is also distinguishable from this reference for at least the same reasons set forth in connection with claim 21, and Applicants request that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claims 23 and 40 include recitations similar to claim 21. As explained, claim 21 is distinguishable from Heimsoth et al. Accordingly, claims 23 and 40 are also

distinguishable from this reference for at least the same reasons set forth in connection with claim 21. Further, Heimsoth et al. does not teach at least, and **the Examiner did not address** all of the steps recited in claims 23 and 40, including, in particular, the step of “deferring reconstruction of an object by a second RPC mechanism until requested to do so by a program that uses the second RPC mechanism.” These features are not recited in claims 21 and 22. Accordingly, the Examiner’s position that the rejection of these claims apply to the recitations of claims 23 and 40 is improper, and Applicants request that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claim 24 depends on claim 23. As explained, claim 23 is distinguishable from Heimsoth et al. Accordingly, claim 24 is also distinguishable from this reference for at least the same reasons set forth in connection with claim 23, and Applicants request that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claim 25 includes recitations similar to claim 21. As explained, claim 21 is distinguishable from Heimsoth et al. Accordingly, claim 25 is also distinguishable from this reference for at least the same reasons set forth in connection with claim 21.

Further, Heimsoth et al. does not teach at least, and **the Examiner did not address**, all of the steps recited in claim 25, including, in particular, the step of, “deferring reconstruction of an object by a first RPC mechanism until the stream is returned from the second RPC mechanism to the first RPC mechanism in response to the occurrence of an event.” These features are not recited in claims 21 and 22. Accordingly, the Examiner’s position that the rejection of these claims apply to the recitations of claim 25

is improper, and Applicants request that the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claim 26 depends on claim 25. As explained, claim 25 is distinguishable from Heimsoth et al. Accordingly, claim 26 is also distinguishable from this reference for at least the same reasons set forth in connection with claim 25, and Applicants request that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claim 27 includes a combination of steps including, among other things, receiving a stream containing an identifier of an event listener and a self-describing form of an object associated with a request for notification of a particular event within the distributed system, and in response to the occurrence of the event, sending the stream to the identified event listener for reconstruction of the object using program code identified in the stream. Heimsoth et al. does not teach, and the Examiner did not address, these recitations in the Office Action. In fact, the reference does not even teach or suggest event listeners. Further, the above noted recitations of claim 27 are not recited in claims 21 and 22. Accordingly, the Examiner's position that the rejection of these claims apply to the recitations of claim 27 is improper, and Applicants request that the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claims 28 and 29 depend on claim 27. As explained, claim 27 is distinguishable from Heimsoth et al. Accordingly, claims 28 and 29 are also distinguishable from this reference for at least the same reasons set forth in connection with claim 27, and Applicants request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

Claims 30 and 39 include recitations similar to claim 21. As explained, claim 21 is distinguishable from Heimsoth et al. Accordingly, claims 30 and 39 are also distinguishable from this reference for at least the same reasons set forth in connection with claim 21, and Applicants request that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claim 31 depends on claim 30. As explained, claim 30 is distinguishable from Heimsoth et al. Accordingly, claim 31 is also distinguishable from this reference for at least the same reasons set forth in connection with claim 30, and Applicants request that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claim 32 includes recitations similar to claim 23. As explained, claim 23 is distinguishable from Heimsoth et al. Accordingly, claim 32 is also distinguishable from this reference for at least the same reasons set forth in connection with claim 23. Further, Heimsoth et al. does not teach at least, and the Examiner did not address, all of the steps recited in claim 32, including, in particular, the step of, "deferring reconstruction of an object by a second RPC mechanism until requested to do so by a program that uses the second RPC mechanism." These features are not recited in claims 21 and 22. Accordingly, the Examiner's position that the rejection of these claims apply to the recitations of claim 32 is improper, and Applicants request that the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claim 33 depends on claim 32. As explained, claim 32 is distinguishable from Heimsoth et al. Accordingly, claim 33 is also distinguishable from this reference for at least the same reasons set forth in connection with claim 32, and Applicants request that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

Claim 34 includes recitations similar to claim 25. As explained, claim 25 is distinguishable from Heimsoth et al. Accordingly, claim 34 is also distinguishable from this reference for at least the same reasons set forth in connection with claim 25. Further, Heimsoth et al. does not teach at least, and **the Examiner did not address** all of the steps recited in claim 34, including, in particular, the step of "deferring reconstruction of an object by a first RPC mechanism until the stream is returned from the second RPC mechanism to the first RPC mechanism in response to the occurrence of an event." These features are not recited in claims 21 and 22. Accordingly, the Examiner's position that the rejection of these claims apply to the recitations of claim 34 is improper, and Applicants request that the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claim 35 depends on claim 34. As explained, claim 34 is distinguishable from Heimsoth et al. Accordingly, claim 35 is also distinguishable from this reference for at least the same reasons set forth in connection with claim 34, and Applicants request that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claim 36 includes recitations similar to claim 27. As explained, claim 36 is distinguishable from Heimsoth et al. Accordingly, claim 36 is also distinguishable from this reference for at least the same reasons set forth in connection with claim 27. Further, Heimsoth et al. does not teach at least, and **the Examiner did not address**, the recitations of this claim. Accordingly, the Examiner's position that the rejection of claims 21 and 22 apply to the recitations of claim 36 is improper, and Applicants request that the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

Claims 37 and 38 depend on claim 36. As explained, claim 36 is distinguishable from Heimsoth et al. Accordingly, claims 37 and 38 are also distinguishable from this reference for at least the same reasons set forth in connection with claim 36, and Applicants request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Further, Heimsoth et al. does not teach, **and the Examiner did not address**, an apparatus for providing notification of an event in a distributed system including, among other things, a transmitting machine, an event generator, and an event listener, as recited in claim 41. For example, Heimsoth et al. does not disclose or even suggest an event listener that is configured to reconstruct an object by accessing program code identified in a stream, as recited in the claim. Accordingly, the Examiner's position that the rejection of claims 21 and 22 apply to the recitations of claim 41 is improper, and Applicants request that the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Moreover, Heimsoth et al. does not teach, **and the Examiner did not address**, an apparatus for deferring reconstruction of an object in a distributed system including, among other things, a transmitting machine and an intermediate machine configured to perform the features recited in claim 42. For example, Heimsoth et al. does not disclose or even suggest, at least an intermediate machine configured to store a received stream, and send the stream to a receiving machine in response to the occurrence of an event. Also, Heimsoth et al. does not teach a receiving machine that reconstructs the object by accessing program code identified in the stream, as recited in claim 42.

Accordingly, the Examiner's position that the rejection of claims 21 and 22 apply to the

recitations of claim 42 is improper, and Applicants request that the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Because Heimsoth et al. does not teach the recitations of claims 21-42, and the Examiner did not address all of the recitations of claims 23-42, Applicants request reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejections, and the timely allowance, of these claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this Amendment and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: September 5, 2003

By: 

Joseph E. Palys
Reg. No. 46,508

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com